



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/787,226

02/27/2004

Ryan Mason

049051-0222

4844

31824 7590 09/29/2009  
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
18191 VON KARMAN AVE.  
SUITE 500  
IRVINE, CA 92612-7108

EXAMINER

BELANI, KISHIN G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2443

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/29/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/787,226	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MASON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> KISHIN G. BELANI	<b>Art Unit</b> 2443	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,17,19-21,23-25,27 and 31-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,9-12,17,19-21,23-25,27 and 31-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's RCE filed on 07/14/2009. **Independent claims 1, 7, 17 and 21 have been amended. Claims 26 and 28-30 have been cancelled. New dependent claims 33-36 have been added. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21, 23-25, 27 and 31-36 are now pending** in the present application. The applicants' amendments to claims are shown in ***bold and italics***, and the examiner's response to the amendments is shown in **bold** in this office action.

#### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/14/2009 has been entered.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

**Claims 1, 7, 17, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contain subject

Art Unit: 2443

matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 7, 17, and 21 include a new limitation reciting “an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop”. However, paragraph 0048 of the instant application lists over 12 different operating systems to which the invention applies, many of which are non Microsoft-Windows based operating systems that the applicants are trying to exclude from the independent claims by adding the limitation cited above, in order to distinguish the claims from the prior art cited in the previous office actions. However, such ambiguity does not reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 2443

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**Claims 1, 7, 17, 21, and 33-36** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)**.

Consider **claim 1**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that

Art Unit: 2443

shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), comprising: a desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a window over a desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details), wherein a user can either select the first connection icon or an active area on the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a "New Connector" active area on the desktop window to define a new connection or to select one of the previously defined connection (three of which are shown); column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details), wherein selecting the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7),

wherein selecting the active area allows a new connection window to appear (column 6, lines 34-38 which disclose using the “New Connection Wizard” by clicking on the active area labeled “New Connector” to initiate a new connection, then configuring it by supplying property values for the new connection object in Fig. 7) and, upon designating a new connection, allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows three different connections on the desktop window that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons in the desktop window; column 6, lines 29-34 describe the same details),

wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different from the first connection, between the remote computing device and a second local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection “Office” icon, connecting a client’s computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection “Work From Home” icon, connecting a client’s computer/laptop at home with the server on the office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, wherein the first application is different from the second application; and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device; **and wherein the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.**

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed user interface, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, wherein the first application is different from the second application; and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 (the first connection) provides access to Tool A (application 1130) to be executed on the "Remote System 1", i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server) and connection 1112 (the second connection) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) to be executed on the "Remote System 2", i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface on a desktop, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and wherein the first application is different from the second application, and wherein the desktop is operative to display at least a first application icon directly on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user a



graphical interface to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***

In the same field of endeavor, Martinez et al. show and disclose the claimed user interface, wherein ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop*** (Fig. 2, LCD Desktop Display 124 with non-modifiable connection icons 314 (for connection to a LAN) and 316 (for connection to a WAN, e.g. the Internet); abstract that describes a processor-based system with an LCD display that includes six non-modifiable icons including LAN connection icon and WAN connection icon; column 3, line 20 through column 4, line 63 disclose the details of the “booting” process of the device using ROM based BIOS (non Microsoft-Window based operating system) software, and further describing the details of the connection icons 314 and 316).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, in the remote computing device, an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop, as taught by Martinez et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., because such an operating system is the most prevalent windows-based operating system.

Consider **claim 7**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a method for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), comprising the steps of:

displaying a desktop at the remote computing device (Fig. 6 that displays a desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections at the remote computing device);

displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a window over a desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details);

receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g.

configuration information for the “Office” connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7);

receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a “New Connector” active area on the desktop window to define a new connection; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details);

wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop, wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a second connection “Work From Home” icon, connecting a client’s computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network, which is different than a first connection (shown as “Office” in Fig. 6)).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application; and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device; **and wherein the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.**

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is

for a second application, and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 (the first connection) provides access to Tool A (application 1130) to be executed on the “Remote System 1”, i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server) and connection 1112 (the second connection) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) to be executed on the “Remote System 2”, i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the method of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user a graphical interface to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***

In the same field of endeavor, Martinez et al. show and disclose the claimed method, wherein ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop*** (Fig. 2, LCD Desktop Display 124 with non-modifiable connection icons 314 (for connection to a LAN) and 316 (for connection to a WAN, e.g. the Internet); abstract that describes a processor-based system with an LCD display that includes six non-modifiable icons including LAN connection icon and WAN connection icon; column 3, line 20 through column 4, line 63 disclose the details of the “booting” process of the device using ROM based BIOS (non Microsoft-Window based operating system) software, and further describing the details of the connection icons 314 and 316).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, in the remote computing device, an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop, as taught by Martinez et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., because such an operating system is the most prevalent windows-based operating system.

Consider **claim 17**, Falcon et al. disclose a computer-executable program code stored on a computer readable medium for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (claim 11; Fig. 6 that shows a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that

Art Unit: 2443

shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), the computer-executable program code comprising:

code for displaying a desktop at the remote computing device (Fig. 6 that displays a desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections at the remote computing device);

code for displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a window over a desktop with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the connection interface in more details);

code for receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7);

code for receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop (Fig. 6 that further shows a “New Connector” active area on the desktop to define a new connection; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details), wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows three different connections on the desktop window that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons on the desktop window; column 6, lines 29-34 describe the same details), wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection “Office” icon, connecting a client’s computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection “Work From Home” icon, connecting a client’s computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, and code for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device; ***and wherein the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and code for displaying at least a

first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 (the first connection) provides access to Tool A (application 1130) to be executed on the "Remote System 1", i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server) and connection 1112 (the second connection) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) to be executed on the "Remote System 2", i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-executable program code stored on a computer-readable medium, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and code for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user with the executable program code to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***



In the same field of endeavor, Martinez et al. show and disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop*** (Fig. 2, LCD Desktop Display 124 with non-modifiable connection icons 314 (for connection to a LAN) and 316 (for connection to a WAN, e.g. the Internet); abstract that describes a processor-based system with an LCD display that includes six non-modifiable icons including LAN connection icon and WAN connection icon; column 3, line 20 through column 4, line 63 disclose the details of the “booting” process of the device using ROM based BIOS (non Microsoft-Window based operating system) software, and further describing the details of the connection icons 314 and 316).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, in the remote computing device, an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop, as taught by Martinez et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., because such an operating system is the most prevalent windows-based operating system.

Consider **claim 21**, Falcon et al. show and disclose a programmed computer apparatus for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface (Fig. 6 that shows a computer desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections; Fig. 7 that shows a

Art Unit: 2443

computer desktop with a user interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details), said programmed computer apparatus comprising:

means for displaying a desktop at the remote computing device (Fig. 6 that displays a computer desktop with a user interface for setting up network and Internet connections at the remote computing device),

means for displaying at least a first connection icon directly on the desktop, the first connection icon representing a first connection between the remote computing device and a first local computing device (Fig. 6 that shows a window over a desktop on a computer with a plurality of connection icons named "Office", "Work From Home" and "MSN" to select from, wherein each connection icon (under the "Connector Name" heading) represents a connection between a server (a first local computing device) and a client/user computer (the remote computing device); column 6, lines 29-43 describe the claimed apparatus in more details);

means for receiving a user selection of the first connection icon, wherein the user selection of the first connection icon allows a first connection represented by the first connection icon to become modifiable to alter the first connection (Fig. 7 that shows a user interface for receiving configuration information from a user for a selected connection (e.g. configuration information for the "Office" connection shown in Fig. 6); further showing different tabs that allow a user to modify the configuration settings of the selected connection; column 7, lines 1-27 disclose the details of the connection properties that may be modified for each one of the tabs shown in Fig. 7);

means for receiving a user selection of an active area of the desktop, wherein the user selection of the active area allows a second connection icon for a second application to be displayed directly on the desktop (Fig. 6 that shows a “New Connector” active area on the desktop window to define a new connection; Fig. 6 further shows three different connections on the desktop window that were created by the new connection wizard, then displayed as icons on the desktop window; column 6, lines 29-38 describe the same details);

wherein the second connection icon represents a second connection different than the first connection (Fig. 6 that shows a first connection “Office” icon, connecting a client’s computer/workstation with the server on an office LAN, and a second connection “Work From Home” icon, connecting a client’s computer/laptop at home with the server on the Office LAN network).

However, Falcon et al. do not specifically disclose that the first connection icon is for a first application and the second connection icon is for a second application, and means for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device; ***and wherein the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***

In the same field of endeavor, Coulthard et al. show and disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and means for displaying at least a

first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device (Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 (the first connection) provides access to Tool A (application 1130) to be executed on the "Remote System 1", i.e. 1120 (corresponding to the first local computing device, a first server) and connection 1112 (the second connection) provides access to Tool C (application 1150) to be executed on the "Remote System 2", i.e. 1122 (corresponding to the second local computing device, a second server); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a programmed computer apparatus, wherein a first connection is for a first application and the second connection is for a second application, and means for displaying at least a first application icon on the desktop at the remote computing device, wherein the first application icon represents an application available for execution on the first local computing device, as taught by Coulthard et al., in the programmed computer apparatus of Falcon et al., so as to provide a user an apparatus to set up and manage network connections based on the needed applications.

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., do not specifically disclose that ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop.***

In the same field of endeavor, Martinez et al. show and disclose the claimed apparatus, wherein ***the remote computing device includes an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop*** (Fig. 2, LCD Desktop Display 124 with non-modifiable connection icons 314 (for connection to a LAN) and 316 (for connection to a WAN, e.g. the Internet); abstract that describes a processor-based system with an LCD display that includes six non-modifiable icons including LAN connection icon and WAN connection icon; column 3, line 20 through column 4, line 63 disclose the details of the “booting” process of the device using ROM based BIOS (non Microsoft-Window based operating system) software, and further describing the details of the connection icons 314 and 316).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include, in the remote computing device, an operating system which does not allow a connection icon to be modified from the desktop, as taught by Martinez et al., in the apparatus of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., because such an operating system is the most prevalent windows-based operating system.

Consider **claim 33**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., further show and disclose the claimed user interface, wherein when the remote computing device connects to the first local computing device, the desktop is operative to automatically display, directly on the

desktop of the remote computing device, a plurality of applications stored and executable on the first local computing device (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11 that shows the Remote System Explorer desktop 1110 of the remote computing device (client) with a plurality of connection icons 1111-1113 corresponding to establishing connections with a plurality of remote systems 1120-1124, and a list of stored and executable applications 1130-1150 under each connection icon respectively; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Consider **claim 34**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., further show and disclose the claimed method, further comprising the step of, when the remote computing device connects to the first local computing device, automatically displaying, directly on the desktop of the remote computing device, a plurality of applications stored and executable on the first local computing device (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11 that shows the Remote System Explorer desktop 1110 of the remote computing device (client) with a plurality of connection icons 1111-1113 corresponding to establishing connections with a plurality of remote systems 1120-1124, and a list of stored and executable applications 1130-1150 under each connection icon respectively; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Consider **claim 35**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., further show and disclose the claimed

computer-executable program code, comprising: code for, when the remote computing device connects to the first local computing device, automatically displaying, directly on the desktop of the remote computing device, a plurality of applications stored and executable on the first local computing device (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11 that shows the Remote System Explorer desktop 1110 of the remote computing device (client) with a plurality of connection icons 1111-1113 corresponding to establishing connections with a plurality of remote systems 1120-1124, and a list of stored and executable applications 1130-1150 under each connection icon respectively; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

Consider **claim 36**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., further show and disclose the claimed apparatus, comprising: means for, when the remote computing device connects to the first local computing device, automatically displaying, directly on the desktop of the remote computing device, a plurality of applications stored and executable on the first local computing device (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11 that shows the Remote System Explorer desktop 1110 of the remote computing device (client) with a plurality of connection icons 1111-1113 corresponding to establishing connections with a plurality of remote systems 1120-1124, and a list of stored and executable applications 1130-1150 under each connection icon respectively; paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

**Claims 3, 9, 19 and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)** and further in view of **Perholtz et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2002/0091850 A1)**.

Consider **claim 3**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., show and disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, except further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose a user interface, further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that



disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, further comprising a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local

computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 9**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., show and disclose the claimed method for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, except further comprising the step of displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose the claimed method, further comprising the step of displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of “Hot Keys”; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of “Hot Keys” for redirecting remote client’s input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client’s normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three

Art Unit: 2443

times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method, further comprising the step of displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 19**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., show and disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Perholtz et al. disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, comprising code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Claims 1-5; Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of “Hot Keys”; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of “Hot Keys” for redirecting remote client’s input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client’s normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either

applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pulldown menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-executable program code, comprising code for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device, as taught by Perholtz et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide a user ability to use hot keys to execute applications at the local computing device as well as at the remote computing device, and be able to easily switch between them.

Consider **claim 23**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Martinez et al., and Perholtz et al., further show and disclose a programmed computer apparatus for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device using a user interface, comprising

Art Unit: 2443

means for displaying a keystroke management window, wherein the keystroke management window is user modifiable to accept a local keystroke management setting, wherein if the local keystroke management setting is enabled, a keystroke is processed at the remote computing device, and wherein if the local keystroke management setting is disabled, the keystroke is processed at the first local computing device (Flowchart of Fig. 7G, decision block 759 that checks for use of "Hot Keys"; paragraph 0288, lines 1-16 that disclose the use of "Hot Keys" for redirecting remote client's input keystrokes/mouse data to the local server and means to return back to the remote client's normal mode of operation by tapping the left shift key three times within 2 seconds; although no window is shown for selecting an option to make hot key sequences effective either at a local computing device or at a remote computing device, the paragraph does mention selecting from a menu, either Remote PC mode or Host mode. Based on the user selection, the hot keys are either applicable at the remote computing device, or at the local computing device. Therefore, the examiner has taken the official notice that the use of keystrokes achieves the same purpose as the mouse clicks on a GUI interface, as is evident when copying a paragraph from one document and pasting it into another document. One may use Ctrl-c keyboard keys to copy a selected paragraph or use a pull-down menu (GUI) or a toolbar icon to copy the paragraph).

**Claims 4, 10, 25, 27 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of

**Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)** and further in view of **Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,039,709 B1)**.

Consider **claim 4**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 5A, "Select Default Server" block 507, "Override Defaults" block 511, and "Update Settings" button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

Consider **claim 10**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed method, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose a method for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device, using a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, Fig. 5A, “Select Default Server” block 507, “Override Defaults” block 511, and “Update Settings” button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method for a user interface, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

Consider **claim 25**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., further disclose the claimed user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows the user to edit or



delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., do not specifically disclose the user interface wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, and wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose the claimed user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be “dumber” systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network); and wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, and wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, as taught by Beadle et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide support for connection management to clients with thin remote devices.

Consider **claim 27**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein selecting the first connection icon allows the user to edit or delete the first connection (in Falcon et al. reference, Fig. 7 which shows a second interface to manage connections by setting different configuration options for a connection; column 2, lines 7-9 disclose the same details); and wherein the first application is different from the second application (in Coulthard et al. reference, Fig. 11, that shows three different connections 1111-1113 between a Developer 1 and three Remote Systems 1120, 1122 and 1124, wherein connection 1111 provides access to Tool A (application 1130) and connection 1112 provides access to Tool C (application 1150); paragraph 0099 describes the same details).

However, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., do not specifically disclose that the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose the claimed computer-executable program code for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client (column 1, lines 32-34 which disclose that clients can be “dumber” systems (thin clients) adapted for limited use with a network);

wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client (column 2, lines 54-57 that disclose a graphical user interface for receiving user selection at the remote thin client, and a connection utility for connecting the client with a selected local server); and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device (Fig. 10 that shows a second connection using modem transmission; column 10, lines 6-24 which disclose a first connection via satellite to a DirectPC application and a second modem connection to a server for a financial application).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code, wherein the remote computing device is a thin client, wherein the user interface is to be displayed at the thin client, and wherein the second connection is between the thin client and a second local computing device, as taught by Beadle et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide support for connection management to clients with thin remote devices.

Consider **claim 31**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority.

In the same field of endeavor, Beadle et al. disclose computer-executable program code, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each

includes a priority (in Beadle et al. reference, claims 10-12; Fig. 5A, "Select Default Server" block 507, "Override Defaults" block 511, and "Update Settings" button 515 that enable a user to set priorities in selecting different connections and other options; Fig. 6A that lists some of the options 601 that can be assigned priority values to arrive at the relative ratings 605; column 8, lines 28-33 that disclose the same details).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code, wherein the first connection icon and the second connection icon each includes a priority, as taught by Beadle et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to allow users to assign different priorities to defined connections.

**Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)** and further in view of **Lele (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,181,524 B1)**.

Consider **claim 5**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses a user interface, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a user interface for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

**Claims 6, 12, 20 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)** and further in view of **Ritchy et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0183831 A1)**.

Consider **claim 6**, and **as it applies to claim 1 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed user interface, except further comprising a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is

modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a desktop window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, wherein if the desktop shell setting is disabled, an alternate user interface is selected and the user interface is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the user interface of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide multiple operating systems environments for the user to choose from, based on user's preferences, on the same desktop.

Consider **claim 12**, and **as it applies to claim 7 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed method, except further comprising the steps of displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a desktop window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device

Art Unit: 2443

to accept a desktop shell setting; selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide multiple operating systems environments for the user to choose from, based on user's preferences, on the same desktop.

Consider **claim 20**, and **as it applies to claim 17 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except said program code comprising code for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; code for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and code for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. disclose a computer-readable storage medium with stored program code, said program comprising code for permitting the computer to perform a step for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; a selecting step for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; a disabling step for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Claims 20-38, 60-80, and 101-120; that shows a default desktop window with a user interface (pull-down) to select an alternate desktop



Art Unit: 2443

shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a computer-readable storage medium with stored program code for managing a connection between a local computing device and a remote computing device, said program comprising code for permitting the computer to perform a step for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting; a selecting step for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; a disabling step for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide a user ability to select any one of the many available desktop shells that is most suited to the user.

Consider **claim 24**, and **as it applies to claim 21 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., show and disclose the claimed

Art Unit: 2443

programmed computer apparatus, except further comprising means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled.

In the same field of endeavor, Ritchy et al. show and disclose the claimed programmed computer apparatus, further comprising means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled (Fig. 9 that shows a default desktop window and a pull-down to select alternate desktop shell if the user so desires; paragraph 0049, lines 9-11 which disclose that different shells for the desktop are selectable in the Property Editor window, and portal administrators and end users can also change a desktop's shell, thereby disclosing that the desktop shell window is modifiable at run-time by the user at the remote computing device to accept a desktop shell setting, selecting an alternate user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, and disabling the improved user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide means for displaying a desktop shell window, wherein the desktop shell window is modifiable at run time by a user at the remote computing device; means for selecting an alternate user interface, if the

desktop shell setting is disabled; and means for disabling the user interface, if the desktop shell setting is disabled, as taught by Ritchy et al., in the programmed computer apparatus of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al. and Martinez et al., so as to provide a user ability to select any one of the many available desktop shells that is most suited to the user.

**Claims 11 and 32** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Falcon et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,295,556 B1)** in view of **Coulthard et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication # 2004/0003371 A1)** and further in view of **Martinez et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 6,901,557 B1)** and further in view of **Beadle et al. (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,039,709 B1)** and further in view of **Lele (U.S. Patent Publication # 7,181,524 B1)**.

Consider **claim 11**, and **as it applies to claim 10 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Martinez et al., and Beadle et al., disclose the claimed method, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses the claimed method, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a method for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device using a user interface, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the method of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Martinez et al., and Beadle et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

Consider **claim 32**, and **as it applies to claim 31 above**, Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Martinez et al., and Beadle et al., disclose the claimed computer-executable program code, except wherein the priority is a failover order.

In the same field of endeavor, Lele discloses the claimed computer-executable program code, wherein the priority is a failover order (column 1, lines 21-27 that disclose a plurality of servers connected in a server cluster to provide failover redundancy; Fig. 1, Rules block 154 and Selection Algorithm block 155 that specify server selection criteria; thereby disclosing server failover order that a user may specify as a priority option in the connection management).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide computer-executable program code for managing a connection between a remote computing device and a local computing device, wherein the priority is a failover order, as taught by Lele, in the computer-executable program code of Falcon et al., as modified by Coulthard et al., Martinez et

Art Unit: 2443

al., and Beadle et al., so as to provide an alternate connection path to a server, in case the selected server fails.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-7, 9-12, 17, 19-21 and 23-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Any response to this Office Action should be **faxed to (571) 273-8300 or mailed to:**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Art Unit: 2443

**Hand-delivered responses** should be brought to

Customer Service Window  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Kishin G. Belani whose telephone number is (571) 270-1768. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free) or 703-305-3028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/customer service whose telephone number is (571) 272-0800.

*/K. G. B./*  
*Examiner, Art Unit 2443*

September 16, 2009

*/George C Neurauter, Jr./*  
*Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443*